

SECRET

DCI/IC 75-1075

24 November 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: AC/MPRRD/IC

SUBJECT : FY-76 KEP

1. Even though the numbers are still jumping around (for example, we received a number of redrafted NIO assessments just late last week), we now know the general outlines of FY-75 KEP findings. We are continuing to examine these data to exploit them as fully as possible in furthering the DCI's objective of using the KI/Qs/KEP process so as to relate outcome and performance to priorities and resource allocations. Concurrently, parts of the Community are beginning to formulate FY-76 collection and production strategies. Thus, it is time to decide where we want to go with the FY-76 KEP.

2. Before we can resolve this question, we must decide how much frustration we are willing to endure, how determined is the DCI in achieving his announced objective and, perhaps more to the point, what are our chances for success in getting George Carver to argue philosophy and practicability before the DCI for the purpose of getting clear-cut direction from the Director on the FY-76 KEP. (Please note, we are not suggesting yet another attempt to work things out with Carver and avoid going to the DCI. We don't feel, given the number of times we've been to the well, that Carver would be any more receptive now than in the past. He, in effect, seems to view greater involvement of the collection committees as a usurpation of NIO role in KEP (and their ability to keep it limited?).)

3. Assuming that the Director meant what he said about the KI/Q/KEP process, it is essential that order and consistency be introduced into the effort. That means some fundamental issues must be resolved.

a. Who is in charge of the process--it cannot continue to be split between ICS and the NIOs.

SECRET

SECRET

b. Given IRAC's consensus (copy attached) "... that the process should provide answers on where additional effort was required and conversely, where resources could be reduced ... how much more management cost will the DCI accept? (the Community seems much more receptive to increases than does the DCI).

c. What roles should CPAD and PRD play in the process.

d. Whatever may be the answers to the foregoing, it is clear that a credible performance evaluation effort must have a definitive point of departure--either an unambiguously defined/described baseline of knowledge, or clear-cut goals/objectives expressed in terms suitable for tasking by responsible program level authorities (see HSC comments re FY-75 Strategies, copy attached).

4. You already know our thoughts on KIQ Strategies and have seen our proposed* approach which reflected CPAD's and PRD's decision not to become involved.

X1 5. My understanding is that recently in reviewing the CPAD position, [] came to the conclusion that CPAD has a necessary part to play in the process, in essence doing the job for which CCPC was designed, but has never undertaken (developing integrated Community collection plans for specific collection objectives based on considerations of individual sensor/platform/source capabilities, expected performance on the basis of past productivity, and optimum collective usage of total Community collection assets). In our view, this is a long overdue and positive approach--an approach which, if allowed to be implemented, would help make the Strategies more useful, take a load off the MIOs and materially assist the USIB collection committees in more effectively carrying out their part of the collection tasking process.

6. In the final analysis, it all comes down to a question of improving the Strategies, and that means taking

* Memorandum for the Director, prepared 11 July 1975.
Subject: FY-76 KIQ Strategy Report Development

SECRET

SECRET

on George Carver and his NIOs. The alternatives seem clear; either we face the strategy issue head-on or leave the NIOs and IC alone to respond to George Carver's 5 November exhortation to get on with the development of FY-76 Strategies (copy attached). This approach will not allow the process to achieve the DCI's announced objective of relating outcome and performance to priorities and resource allocations and in all likelihood will prevent us from duplicating the aggregations and analysis we were able to do this year. For your information, we believe the NIO inputs to be the limiting factor on what can come out of KEP-75. The collection and production components of the Community have provided sufficient data that, if the NIO strategies and then their evaluations were improved, an overall qualitative increase could result.

7. While this is the central question that ultimately must be faced, there is a saving grace in that we do not have to join the issue without having some prior indication of the DCI's inclinations as evidenced by the reaction to our proposed letters to program managers on the FY-75 KEP. Be that as it may, we do not have a great deal of time if we are to address the issue productively.

AC/MPRRD/R&A

25X

Attachments

1. HSC-ESG-035
2. IRAC consensus
3. USIB-B-22.1/46

Distribution:

- Orig. - Addee w/atts
- 1 - IC/REG w/atts
 - 1 - MPRRD/R&A Subject w/atts
 - 1 - MPRRD/R&A Reading w/o atts
 - 1 - AGH Chrono w/o atts

SECRET